

Tilburg University

Ritual Studies

Post, Paul

Published in:
Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion

DOI:
[10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.21](https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.21)

Publication date:
2015

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Post, P. (2015). Ritual Studies. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion* Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.21>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Religion: Oxford Research Encyclopedias

Ritual Studies

Paul Post

Online Publication Date: Sep
2015

Subject: Rituals, Practices, and Symbolism
DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.21

Summary and Keywords

Ritual studies is not a school, nor is it a theory or a method; it is a multi- or interdisciplinary platform for the academic, critical, and systematic study of ritual, or in the words of the founding father of ritual studies, Ronald Grimes: it is a field. The platform of ritual studies, which emerged in the mid-1970s, initially combined the fields of religious studies, anthropology, liturgical studies, and theater studies.

The emergence of ritual studies as a field of research of its own fits seamlessly into a broader development in academia that took place in three phases. The first phase took place during the second half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries, when academic disciplines came into being and formed distinct profiles. The study of ritual plays a prominent role in (comparative) religious studies (Eliade, Otto, Van der Leeuw), in philosophy (ritual and symbol, Ricoeur), in anthropology and sociology (Durkheim, Turner), in psychology (Jung), and in cultural history (Huizinga). There was at this time remarkably little interest in ritual among theologians. It was not until the influence of the Liturgical Movement that a change occurred. The second phase took place during the long decade of the 1960s, which saw the start of a fruitful interdisciplinary phase. Rituals were thought to offer an effective entrance into a culture, allowing one to penetrate it deeply. The liturgical renewal project also took place after Vaticanum II, and it was in this setting that the term “ritual studies” was first used by the American Academy of Religion in 1977. The beginning of the 21st century saw the start of a new phase, during which different disciplines have been connected and integrated into large, multidisciplinary thematic clusters. In this context, the field of ritual studies features in a broad range of studies, including cultural memory studies, media and communication studies, death studies, leisure studies, material religion studies, migration studies, and many others.

Keywords: ritual, ritual studies, ritual theory, ritual and culture

Ritual Studies as a Multidisciplinary Platform

Ritual studies has become a recognized academic field, although there are different views of what it covers. The term was first documented by the American Academy of Religion in 1977, and shortly thereafter ritual studies became established as a field of research in the late 1970s and 1980s. Ronald Grimes in particular (a student of Victor Turner) put ritual studies on the academic map. His book *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (1982) and the bibliographical handbook *Research in Ritual Studies. A Programmatic Essay and Bibliography* (1985) were important in this initial phase.¹

This period and place where ritual studies arose and became established determined the profile of ritual studies initially. It was the time of liturgical renewal after the Second Vatican Council, the period of an anthropological turn in liturgical studies. Although ritual still bore a stigma and was considered to be “churchy,” traditional, formal, conservative, and boring, a change in thinking could be detected. Rite and symbol were again placed on the agendas of academia, society, and culture. There was a growing interest in ritual in practice and theory. In that context, scholars in the United States had meetings on the subject at the American Academy of Religion as well as at the American Anthropology Association and the North American Academy of Liturgy. Grimes played a key role at

all these platforms. In particular, he was in high demand as an anthropologist and expert in rituals in discussions on liturgical renewal after Vatican II. He discussed the renewed liturgy critically in conferences and workshops, and was a welcome guest in Roman Catholic circles especially, primarily because, unlike Victor Turner and Mary Douglas, he had an open and constructively critical attitude toward the liturgical and strongly ecumenical dynamics of those years. The strongly programmatic conference *Reclaiming Our Rites*, held at the Notre Dame Center for Pastoral Liturgy in 1992, included papers by Ronald Grimes, Catherine Bell, and Roy Rappaport and can be considered a kind of end point of this period.² Further stimulus occurred with the start of the *Journal of Ritual Studies* in 1987.

The rise and establishment of ritual studies had clear parallels in other multidisciplinary platforms in this period, such as cultural studies.³

It is interesting to see how the profile of ritual studies developed in the initial period and which disciplines collaborated around the subject of ritual. A select group of disciplines initially examined ritual, including religious studies, anthropology, liturgical studies, and theater studies. It was primarily religious studies that provided the framework for analysis, and thus some perceived ritual studies as a subdiscipline of religious studies. It is remarkable that Grimes, in his recent survey, *The Craft of Ritual Studies* (2014), dispenses with the nature, profile, and program of ritual studies, which had been areas of concern in the beginning. This is understandable because during the initial phases the field needed to be established and acquire a profile, and thus the question of program and identity was very much present. Historiographically and programmatically, it is still interesting and relevant to look at the search for its own profile and position in academia. In the essay in his bibliographical handbook (1985), Grimes states:

Because ritual studies comprise a newly consolidated field within religious studies, a high degree of methodological and bibliographical self-consciousness is necessary. And because this subject's aspirations are interdisciplinary, it is obligated to differentiate and relate its task to several other disciplines such as liturgical theology, symbolic anthropology, art criticism, history of religions, and psychology of religion. Three major goals of ritual studies are (1) to mediate between normative and descriptive, as well as textual and field-observational, methods; (2) to lay groundwork for a coherent taxonomy and theory that can account for the full range of symbolic acts running from ritualization behavior in animals, through interaction ritual, to highly differentiated religious liturgies and civil ceremonies; and (3) to cultivate the study of ritual in a manner that does not automatically assume it to be a dependent variable.⁴

And also:

Ritual Studies is a field, not a single, prescribed methodology. There is no 'ritual studies viewpoint', but rather a field upon which are focused multiple viewpoints."⁵ It is here that Grimes first introduces the parallel term "ritology" while still speaking of a discipline, although as a "subdiscipline": "Ritual Studies, or 'ritology', is a new field, not because doing ritual or thinking about it is new, but because the effort to consolidate methods from the humanities and social sciences for the study of ritual in a context that is free to be cross-cultural and comparative is new. It is new as a distinct subdiscipline of the academic study of religion."⁶

Shortly afterwards, in the first edition of Eliade's *Encyclopedia of Religion* (1987), Grimes had the chance to present ritual studies as a separate field. He especially wanted to show that collaborating disciplines enriched the field, that each brought its own programmatic perspective:

The study of ritual is not new. Theologians and anthropologists, as well as phenomenologists and historians of religion, have included it as one their concerns. What new about Ritual Studies is the deliberate attempt to consolidate a field of inquiry reaching across disciplinary boundaries and coordinating the normative interests of theology and liturgics, the descriptive ones of the history and phenomenology of religion, and the analytical ones of anthropology. As a result of his goal, the discipline of Ritual Studies is less a method one applies than a field one cultivates.⁷

Grimes continued this line of argument, as in 2007 when he stated: "Ritual Studies is not wed to a particular theory, but since its inception in 1977, it has been closely allied with religious studies, anthropology, and performance studies."⁸ Recently (2013, 2014), as stated above, he has become more general and no longer feels the need to

establish ritual studies as a separate field of study. As stated above, in *The Craft of Ritual Studies* he hardly looks at the position of ritual studies explicitly. He simply states that there are scholars who spend most of their research time engaged in ritual studies and there are others who occasionally touch on the field.⁹

If we turn to ritual studies we can see that, in addition to a commonly shared profile, there are two major approaches. Its general profile is directly connected to what we saw in the phase of its rise and establishment. Ritual studies is a platform for systematic, academic research into ritual. But its breadth and interdisciplinary content can change. There is an approach that keeps to a more specific setting in the tradition of ritual studies as it was practiced in the 1970s and 1980s, that is, primarily the interplay between religious studies and anthropology in connection with contemporary ritual. And then there is the open and broad approach to ritual studies in which all studies of rituals have a place. The platform is open: multidisciplinary and multi-method. In principle all ritual comes into view here—past and present, high and small ritual, religious and civil ritual. The author takes the second approach, and that will also affect the structure of this contribution.

A Profile of Ritual Studies: Four Qualifiers for a “Soft Identity”

What is the identity, the profile, of this open platform of ritual studies? There are four elements that together offer a “soft identity” for ritual studies. These will be examined with elaboration on certain aspects.

First: The Basic, Central Object of Ritual Acting

First of all, the central object of ritual studies are ritual acts and practices, or ritual acting. There will be greater elaboration on this when discussion turns to ritual in connection with theorizing ritual. Simply put, ritual studies examine ritual as an act and process.

The Plurality of Methods and Multi/Interdisciplinarity

A second important characteristic is that ritual studies is characterized as a far-reaching plurality of methods. Not only is ritual studies itself not a method—it does not derive its identity from a certain method in any way—even more, it is the other way around, the profile is linked to the fact that ritual studies do not have one method, but is characterized by a *plurality* of methods that is again part of the multi-, interdisciplinary nature of the field. It is an area that exists beyond disciplinary demarcations and fits into the current phase in which innovative research breaking new ground is increasingly found in multi- and interdisciplinary contexts.

A Set of Perspectives or Characteristics

Third, ritual studies is characterized by a set of perspectives or features that also determine the heuristics of the field to an important extent. Handling these features constitutes what Grimes calls in his survey “The Craft of Ritual Studies” (2014). One set stands out: theory and method.

Theory and Method

A first dominant characteristic is the strong interest in theory and method within ritual studies. We should mention that ritual studies is primarily interested in theory and much less so in application, in working with theoretical insights. Grimes reproaches a set of authors by name (from Victor Turner to Jonathan Smith and Charles Laughlin) for not paying enough attention to method, to the question of how to operationalize a theory. That theorizing plays a key role in ritual studies became apparent recently, for example, in the strong theoretical contribution to the large research project *Ritual Dynamics* in Heidelberg (with a large international conference in 2008)¹⁰ and the two-volume book project *Theorizing Ritual* (2009).¹¹

The formation of theory is directed at various aspects of ritual. If it concerns the general view of approach to ritual, we can distinguish three groups of ritual studies scholars.

- (a) First, there is the view of ritual as traditional, with a “high” profile. This concerns the “high profile” repertoires, the rites of passage, feasts, the cycle of life and year; often ritual is liturgy and ceremony. This line of inquiry includes such major scholars such as Victor Turner, Mary Douglas, Roy Rappaport, and Jan

Assmann.

(b) A second group sees ritual as less marked off and more open like a process; ritual has all kinds of different modes. Here attention is paid to small ritual, emerging ritual, grassroots ritual, and “ritualizing,” to use Ronald Grimes’s words, who, together with Catherine Bell (in part) and Gerard Lukken belongs to this group.

(c) And there is still a remarkable third group that we can call “ritual deconstructivists” or “ritual nihilists.” These theoreticians view the theory formation around ritual in ritual studies and other fields in an extremely critical way. They point to a series of presuppositions that are not often examined. Is “ritual” itself not a Western concept that is transferred too easily to a series of cultural contexts or to the past? And is not the assumption often made that ritual has content, meaning? What is the basis for this assumption? Does ritual have meaning? Is ritual not precisely meaningless, or open and empty, or self-referential? Scholars here are Frits Staal, Dan Sperber, Talal Asad, Walter van Beek, and recently Philippe Buc with his provocative book *The Dangers of Ritual* (2001).¹²

Within this broad framework of theorizing ritual is a series of what can be called classical topics. Naturally, the first here is the search for an adequate definition of ritual. There have been many attempts to come up with a solid definition—constantly, of course, on the basis of specific theoretical insights and views of which a sampling has been given. Sometimes these definitions are brief and to the point, sometimes they are long summaries of characteristics. In *The Craft of Ritual Studies* and the website connected with it Grimes offers an overview of those attempts.¹³ Many of the brief definitions have the disadvantage that they are too short to introduce nuances; for example, such descriptions could also apply to everyday routines. Very extensive definitions often get lost in summaries of very diverse functions and dimensions. Some descriptions nevertheless have a certain value, as is apparent from the fact that they are used again and again. One brings to mind Edmund Leach’s “culturally defined sets of behavior”; Robbie Davis-Floyd’s “A ritual is patterned, repetitive and symbolic enactment of a cultural belief or value; its primary purpose is transformation”; or Lauri Honko’s: “traditional, prescribed communication with the sacred.”¹⁴ The rather hermetic definition by Roy Rappaport has become classic: “the performance of more or less invariant sequences of formal acts and utterances not entirely encoded by the performers.”¹⁵

There are multiple definitions currently in use. Two others will be cited specifically: one by Grimes and one by the present author that is partly inspired by Grimes. In 2000 Grimes gave a threefold description of ritual, spirituality, and religion:

Ritual: sequences of ordinary action rendered special by virtue of their condensation, elevation, or stylization. Spirituality: practiced attentiveness aimed at nurturing a sense of interdependence of all beings sacred and all things ordinary. Religion: spirituality sustained as a tradition or organized into an institution.¹⁶

The appeal of these definitions lies in the cohesion he introduces between ritual, spirituality, and religion, the open approach to ritual from being connected with individual spirituality to institutional forms of religion, and that he does not play the sacred and the profane, the spiritual and the religious over against each other. The current author works with the following definition of ritual:

“Ritual is a more or less repeatable sequence of action units which, take on a symbolic dimension through formalization, stylization, and their situation in place and time.

On the one hand, individuals and groups express their ideas and ideals, their mentalities and identities through these rituals, on the other hand the ritual actions shape, foster, and transform these ideas, mentalities and identities.”¹⁷

Much more agreement can be found on another level of theory, and now also a very emphatically sound method, namely, when it concerns ritual elements or components. In anthropology, primarily when setting up fieldwork projects, there are the traditional “Five P’s” of ritual—Performance, Persons, Period, Paraphernalia, and Place—that Grimes arranges into seven categories: Actions, Actors, Places, Times, Objects, Language, Groups.¹⁸

Partly in reaction to the unsatisfactory search for adequate definitions of ritual, the tendency arose in ritual studies to search instead for qualities of rituals, for functions and dimensions. There are different sets available that together give a good picture of ritual characteristics. With variations on Grimes and Gerard Lukken, the present author came up with the following set:

- discharge function: channeling feelings and emotions;
- ethical function: ritual is never without obligations, it refers to authentic human conduct;
- prophylactic, apotropaic function: healing and coping;
- expressive function: ritual affords the possibility to express feelings, and convictions;
- social function: ritual creates identity, on an individual and community or group level;
- recreative function: ritual offers a contrast to daily life, interrupts it, and offers a moratorium.¹⁹

Another classic element of the theory formation around ritual is the search for classifications and typologies. This is the cornerstone in the theory of ritual because the above-mentioned search for definitions, elements, and functions, and other elements to be discussed below come together here. Here as well we can only give a sampling. Reference is often made to the types of ritual introduced by Catherine Bell.²⁰ That is somewhat surprising because it deviates from divisions that revolve around the basic distinction among life and annual rituals. She distinguishes six types of rituals: (a) life ritual, rites of passage; (b) calendar or annual rites; (c) rites of exchange and communion, sacrifice; (d) rites of affliction and healing; (e) feasts, festivals, and fasts; and (f) political ritual, civil ritual courts, nations, army, royalty, expressing power, hierarchy, and identity. Bell's division is based essentially on a classification of ritual repertoires. A repertoire can be seen as a complex of rituals that show a certain coherence with respect to form, participation, occasion, or context. A ritual repertoire is thus a genre of ritual. One can think here of death rites, initiation rites, rites of passage, pilgrimage rituals, disaster rituals, memorial rituals, and so on.

A variant on the more descriptive division into repertoires is working with ritual zones or domains. In the author's Tilburg research group, *Ritual in Society*, a division of ritual-sacral zones were developed where four large fields were demarcated in current West European culture in which certain dominant ritual repertoires find a place and interact. The research group speaks of (Ritual) Fields of the Sacred.²¹

"Field" does not refer immediately to a zone that possesses a certain coherence through boundaries and delimitations, such as the domestic domain, the public or semipublic domain, or the city. It has to do with zones where a certain coherence and thus identity emerges in the interaction between place and location, cultural practices, and representations in the sense of ideas, ideals, dreams, and visions.

Following this trail of meaningful zones, large fields or zones are seen with more or less their own identity:

- (a)** The Religious Field. The religious field is present in society and culture in institutional manifestations of church buildings, mosques, synagogues and temples, worship, ritual experts and priests, but can also take modern and postmodern forms of spirituality.
- (b)** The Field of Memory Culture. This concerns divergent forms of dealing with the past. Types are, again, very fluid here. Cemeteries, and memorials and memorial spots, documentation centers, and libraries blur into one another here.
- (c)** The "Cultural" Field. The third "cultural" field has to do with the zone of "art and culture." Here we situate the visual arts, architecture, theater, film, art festivals, and music events, concerts (classical and popular). Great attention is placed on museum culture, museums in all shapes and sizes. The fluid transition from the field of memory culture is immediately clear, as is that to the next field of leisure (cf. for instance memorial museums).
- (d)** The Field of Leisure Culture. The umbrella term "leisure culture" refers to the broad and diverse field of our free time, of amusement, ranging from conventional Sunday afternoon activities of nature walks to sports, vacations, festivals, and the varied world of parks and attractions. Important subfields are tourism and sport.

These fields offer numerous perspectives in the further study and analysis of the actual dynamic in the area of religion, culture, and ritual. They also give a view especially of the dynamics of sacrality and sacred zones. They provide insight into the processes of transfer, as the sacred is moved from the one zone to the other, possibly in changed forms (for example, from the religious to the cultural field).

It is surprising to see how Grimes recently (2014) also introduced ritual domains and comes close to the above-mentioned ritual-sacral fields. He cites the following as dominant ritual domains: religion, sport, music, and theater. Here he also reflects on "ritual" itself as a domain.²²

Classifications and divisions help primarily to order material. Larger documentation projects cannot do without it. If we—as indicated—maintain an open and broad approach to ritual studies, the historical research into ritual also falls under ritual studies. We have been seeing for some time already a “ritual turn” in studies of antiquity. Ritual is being discovered in numerous ways in that field as approach and access to ancient cultures.²³ Thus, a large-scale documentation project promises to offer an overview of material concerning cult and ritual in antiquity: *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquarum* (*ThesCRA*). The project is published by the Getty Museum and coordinated by the universities of Heidelberg, Basel, and Wurzburg.²⁴ It is interesting to see what expanded division in particular the project uses—Volume 1: processions, sacrifices, libation, fumigations, dedications; Volume 2: purification, initiation, heroization and apotheosis, banquet, dance, music, cult images rites; Volume 3: divination, prayer, gestures and acts of veneration, *hikesia*, asylum, oath, maledictions, magic rituals; Volume 4: cult places, representations of cult places; Volume 5: personnel of cult, cult instruments; Volume 6: Stages and circumstance of life, work, hunting, travel, death and burial, health, medicines, animals and plants; Volume 7: Festivals and contests; Volume 8: Private space and public space, polarities in religious life, religious interrelations, classical world and neighboring civilizations.

Another approach to division is much more programmatic and less descriptively arranged or heuristic-analytical in nature. That is a division into modes of rituals.²⁵ With this, Grimes maps the process of ritualization, for instance. He sees the following as modes: ritualization, decorum, ceremony, magic, liturgy, celebration. But this brings us rather to the area of ritual as performance and process.

The Comparative, Cross-Cultural Perspective

Since the beginning, including the initial phase of “the legacy” of modern ritual studies, there has been a strong, if not omnipresent, *comparative cross-cultural* working method. Here the influence of comparative religious studies and the tradition of anthropological research are strongly felt. This phenomenological and comparative perspective has yielded much fruit. One can think here of the pioneering work done by Arnold van Gennep and Victor Turner and the concepts of rites of passage, liminality, and religiosity within the framework of the cognitive science (of religion) by Harvey Whitehouse. But cross-cultural and comparative working methods have also been subject to criticism in ritual studies. Turner’s work has been critically questioned for some time (cf. Bell²⁶). It is being increasingly realized that cross-cultural and comparative projects often introduce certain concepts and presuppositions unconsciously and uncritically. Thus, the present author realized quite late in a comparative project in South Africa on sacred sites and pilgrimage, when visiting sacred caves in the Free State (SA) and Lesotho, that there was no word in Africa at all for pilgrimage, even though we were constantly speaking about pilgrimage there as a designation for visits to those sacred caves.²⁷ Another danger of that comparative cross-cultural approach to ritual studies is that there is always a kind of canon of topics and repertoires that remain in the picture. It is no coincidence that we constantly see the categories of feast, pilgrimage, rites of passage, and sacred place coming up again and again. Other rituals, smaller rituals, and new ritual repertoires in particular are often forgotten.

The Performance and Staging Dimension of Ritual

One of the new elements that was introduced into ritual studies in the 1970s and 1980s in establishing the platform of ritual studies was the great attention for the *performance* dimension of ritual acts. Grimes initially worked closely with people from the theater, not only those involved in theater studies but also performers. Jerzy Grotowski (1933–1999), the Polish scholar in theater studies and a theater maker, was strongly present in Grimes’s early work.

The topic of ritual and theater is classic in a broader sense. What are the differences, what are the similarities? Following Turner, Grimes sketches three ways to look at the relation.²⁸ There is the traditional historical method—perhaps we can call it evolutionary—that sees “drama” as an “Ur” action from which ritual and theater develop as separate but related forms. This way of seeing things is strongly connected with the classical Cambridge Myth-and-Ritual School.²⁹ This approach was later continued more or less in the variant of the common matrix. Ritual and drama have the same source, and the perspective of drama and theater can be used fruitfully in the analysis of ritual. One can think here of the influential work of Turner with the concept of social drama, the work of Erving Goffman, and more recently, that of Richard Schechner.³⁰ A third approach to the pair ritual/theater proceeds on the basis of analogy. They are various areas in culture but share certain similarities.

Ritual, the Sacred, and Religion

A following important characteristic of ritual is that there is always, in one way or another, a relation to *sacrality* and *religion*. That emerges, for example, in Grimes's definition of ritual cited above. That appeared to be a "relative" definition in the sense that it was related to religion and spirituality. That continuous relationship of ritual with religion makes thinking, speaking about, and study of ritual particularly complex, especially because the view of sacrality and religion has landed in a major dynamic since the rise of ritual studies as a platform in the 1970s. The perspective of sacrality connected with the quite defined frameworks of institutional forms of religion has not been satisfactory for some time now. Without wanting to provide an overview here of the current debate on the concepts of religion and the sacred, a few general remarks on both concepts against the background of ritual and ritual studies will suffice. To do so, the concept of the sacred is the starting point and Kim Knott, Jonathan Smith, and Martin Stringer will be cited for a theoretical framework.³¹

Whenever we think and speak about "sacrality" or "the sacred" we touch on the widely held distinction between a "substantivistic" approach and a "situational" approach. This distinction in approaches does indeed have heuristic value, but Arie Molendijk correctly shows that the distinction can be made less firm if we look more closely at the work of Robertson Smith, Durkheim, Otto, Van der Leeuw, and Smith.³²

The present author's work has been influenced by that of Jonathan Z. Smith for a long time. Smith also developed a strong situational approach with respect to the sacred and ritual.³³ With respect to working the theory out concretely I rely often on a typology of the sacred that was presented in an article by Mathew Evans in 2003.³⁴ Evans's typology can be mapped out on a matrix of four fields or types: "personal sacred," "civil sacred" (both types are connected with the "natural" dimension), "religious sacred," and "spiritual sacred" (both connected with "the supernatural"). This matrix is also based on an analysis of "sacred" as it is actually used (among other things, via the analysis of newspapers). The division is thus strongly inductively determined. What is very much linked to a great deal of research into current sacred, religious, and ritual dynamics is his distinction between sacrality connected to religious frameworks (Evans calls this "the religious sacred," a sacrality connected with institutions, tradition, authorities, religious/ritual experts, collectivity, and church buildings, temples, etc.), and more open, broad, individual—some would say vague—frameworks of spirituality (which he calls "the spiritual sacred").

With respect to the approach to "religion"³⁵ I also choose an inductive approach as articulated by Martin Stringer in his *Ethnography and the Definition of Religion* (2008).³⁶ Stringer bases his analysis on his years of qualitative research that led to a redefinition of religion. He questioned generally presupposed ideas about religions, one of which—an important one—is that religion is a coherent system. In the everyday life of ordinary people it seems that religion is experienced and lived in a very different way than is thought "from above." In his ethnographical fieldwork in connection with lived religion, the dimension of the "non-empirical, unprovable" emerged as a basic category.³⁷ In the end, Stringer arrives at what he sees as a fundamental layer of religion that becomes apparent in ritual practices in which three elements converge—the unsystematic, the relation with the non-empirical other, and the coping function: "[religion is rooted] in people's unsystematic use of belief statements, their intimate relationships with the non-empirical other, and their need to cope pragmatically with everyday problems."³⁸

In sum, the reference is explicitly to the shared tone set by the above-mentioned authors, Molendijk, Evans, Smith, and Stringer, that is, the continuing and (seen as) inescapable connection of the sacred and religion to actions and (primarily ritual) practices. And within those practices very concrete, tactile elements such as place and material objects play an important role.

The Embodiment Dimension

The dimension of *embodiment* of ritual acts has become a topic high on the agenda of ritual studies primarily through the work of Ronald Grimes and Catherine Bell.³⁹ In addition to the cultural context, there is the anthropological physical context, with all the sensory aspects that are part of the inevitable milieu of rituality. This topic has become very much a matter of discussion recently via a different path, as will be demonstrated, namely, through the strong rise of new media and cyber-ritual.

The Hermeneutical Position of the Researcher

Because of the close relation with modern anthropology, ritual studies also pays a great deal of attention to the

position of the researcher. This is not only a question of the role of the researcher in the method and technique of fieldwork—it goes deeper and further than that. In many respects, the researcher is part of the ritual process itself, and that also determines the analysis and interpretation. This brings us to an area that has, in the meantime, been termed Ritual Criticism which is the title of Grimes's 1990 monograph. There the hermeneutical role of the researcher is discussed explicitly, but ritual criticism includes much more.

Ritual Criticism

The concept of ritual criticism could be found in the theoretical reflections on ritual acts right from the beginning of the advent of ritual studies as a research platform. Ronald Grimes played a key role in this as well. In 1990 he introduced it in a book in which he used theoretical perspectives and connected it with a series of case studies.⁴⁰ Against the background of considerable attention for ritual criticism in his early work, the relatively minor place he accords in his last survey work on ritual studies is striking.⁴¹ The present author assumes this has to do with the fact that Grimes no longer feels it necessary to deal separately with the concept but has now integrated it into all areas of thinking and speaking about ritual. This need was strongly apparent when he, as it were discovered, ritual criticism in carrying out his work in the *Ritual Studies Lab*. If people are confronted with ritual acts, either as participant or as observer, self-reflection, an interplay of involvements and critical distance, is always present. This appears, for example, in the continuing adjustments that people make in rituals. Grimes thus discovered that *ritual enactment* and *critical reflection* are complementary. That is essentially what we call ritual criticism, the continual and structural perspective of the critical examination and evaluation of ritual acts.

In 1992 Catherine Bell established a relation between ritual criticism and both the emic and etic relationship in anthropological research (the interplay between observer and participant is the point here where both meet) as well as cultural and especially literary criticism. She speaks of ritual criticism as a "shared project of both cultural critique and reflexive self-observation."⁴²

The perspective of ritual criticism remains present in Grimes—explicitly or implicitly. The way ritual criticism is done is itself a subject of criticism as well. Grimes continually indicates, as we have recently seen in the series of short video interviews that accompany his book *The Craft of Ritual Studies*,⁴³ that ritual studies is never "objective": one is or becomes part of the ritual process.

In line with this general perspective of ritual criticism, Grimes and many others learned to see "errors" in ritual, rituals that fall short, which are now referred to in the jargon as "infelicitous rituals": rituals can go wrong. In the 1990s Grimes pointed on various occasions (often in Roman Catholic circles) to various shortcomings in ritual renewal process after the Second Vatican Council. Recurring themes of criticism and rituals that, in his view, fall short are: an eye for the context of ritual, the role of women and gender, and especially embodiment. These came together in exemplary fashion in a lecture that was published in 1992 as an article in which the difference between "erectitude" and "supinity" was central.⁴⁴ Erectitude stands for top-down, male, whereas supinity represents being swallowed up by the context, female, rooted and vulnerable.

As stated above, in his *Craft of Ritual Studies* Grimes takes up the theme of ritual criticism briefly as he looks again at what he called the five "vectors" of ritual criticism in an earlier German publication: representation criticism, formal criticism, production criticism, exegetical criticism, and reception criticism.⁴⁵

This author would like to broaden the perspective of ritual criticism somewhat and propose three frameworks that were presented and worked out in 2013.⁴⁶

- (a)** A first framework for ritual criticism could be called, following Grimes, the primary one, namely, critical reflection on ritual connected with *the ritual act itself*. Then the game and how the game is played, including the attitudes (top-down, rooted), actors, effects, and so on are central.
- (b)** A second framework is constituted by the contexts of ritual acts and particularly *normative frameworks* in a group, in a culture. The scope here is broad and diverse. Ritual involves all kinds of interests: political, economic, religious, honor, power. There is also often the issue of group identities, securing or creating traditions, or criticism borrowed from ethical, theological and doctrinal, or ideological criteria and beliefs.
- (c)** A third framework is ritual criticism that emerges from theoretical reflection on ritual. Ritual practices and traditions are, for instance, still approached critically from the perspective of the concept coined by Eric Hobsbawm, that is, "invention of tradition."⁴⁷

The “Canon of Ritual Studies”

From the emerging of the platform of ritual studies we find a kind of canon of topics and themes like tradition, change, innovation, emergence, authority, power, theater, space/place, ritus/mythos, feast, coping, rites of passage, initiation, pilgrimage, disaster ritual, material culture, sacred place and space. This brings us to the last element that, together with the three elements mentioned earlier, determine the soft identity of ritual studies, namely, a certain disciplinary tradition that has grown and developed.

The Academic Tradition

Despite the fluid and open character of ritual studies as a platform, there are also elements that testify to a certain academic profiling and identity. There are manuals, readers, and courses in ritual studies; master's programs; journals like the *Journal of Ritual Studies* or *Yearbook for Liturgical and Ritual Studies*; series published by various publishers; entries in dictionaries and encyclopedias; and research groups. In addition to the canon of topics cited, there are scholars like Van Gennep, Turner, Douglas, Bell, Rappaport, Grimes, and Staal. It is evident that the academic establishment of ritual studies is relatively small. There are hardly any academic chairs in ritual studies (Ronald Grimes held a personal chair from 2005 to 2010 in Nijmegen in the Netherlands, and the present author holds the ritual studies chair at the School of Humanities, Department of Culture Studies at Tilburg University, an institution that has one of the few separate master's programs in ritual studies). The academic infrastructure of ritual studies is linked directly to interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary programs. Permanent structures such as chairs, university programs, and journals are scarce, while there is an abundance of essay collections, conferences, and meetings.

Current Trends and Perspectives

In this final section we will look at the current situation. A few trends and topics will be mentioned in light of current and relevant themes. It is important to note that the field is in constant motion.

It is of major importance that the field of ritual studies is connected with larger multidisciplinary clusters even more than previously. This relativizes the character and profile of ritual studies in the sense that it is brought into relation with other platforms and podiums. An overview via delimited projects and programs is thus more difficult, for there are, after all, several approaches. The classical ritual studies topic of *pilgrimage* may be taken as an example. We can still approach that as a separate topos. But if we attempt to present an overview of the present status it immediately appears that studies of pilgrimage are divided over a series of clusters. Modern pilgrimage studies can longer be approached as an isolated area of research; it is inevitably related to traveling, migration, tourism, and so on. Thus, pilgrimage studies is bound up with studies into (ritual, sacred) space and place⁴⁸, to leisure and tourism⁹, to life writing, travel writing⁵⁰, to politics and power (this very broad domain includes all kinds of studies on power relations, gender, contestations, issues of ritual, political and economic ownership of space and place)⁵¹, to migration, to (super)diversity and culture mobility⁵², to interreligious dynamics⁵³, and, last but not least, to the still remarkable small niche of pilgrimage in the context of study of e-religion and e-ritual.

In what follows, some of these clusters and research areas will be discussed in more detail. The selection is partly personal, partly inspired by the estimation of relevance and perspective for the future.

Cognitive Science: Ritual and Modes of Religiosity

In the last decade Harvey Whitehouse has become an established name in the area of theory on religion and ritual.⁵⁴ He is an advocate of the broad area of the cognitive science approach to ritual and religion. Whitehouse established his reputation with a theory on transmission of religion and “modes of religiosity.” With the help of European Union (EU) funds, he started a project in Oxford called *Explaining Religion* that investigates the origin, variety, and future of religion (EXREL, the project often uses the term “religious repertoires”).⁵⁵ Central to his theory are two basic modes of religiosity, a doctrinal mode and an imagistic mode, which he in turn associated with two sorts of memory. The doctrinal mode, with frequent rituals, redundant and supported by processes of exegesis and catechesis, is linked to semantic memory. He relates the imagistic mode, with rare extraordinary rituals, capable of high arousal, to episodic memory. Whitehouse and his research group connect these modes and ritual repertoires to evolutionary processes. Thus, the doctrinal mode fits better with “more modern” agricultural and industrialized

societies.

Whitehouse also gave one of the best presentations on the urgency of ritual studies.⁵⁶

Ritual in History: Mission Impossible?

One oft-forgotten area in ritual studies is ritual in historical perspective. Historical research into ritual is also a valuable form of ritual studies. We indicated above the “ritual turn” in Ancient Studies. Two examples can show the extremes of (im)possibilities of ritual studies in historical perspective.

The first is a larger and long-term project in the United Kingdom, *The Experience of Worship in a Late Medieval Cathedral and a Parish Church Project* that has been carried out at Bangor University in Wales (UK) under the supervision of John Harper since 2010. The intention is to trace the experiences of medieval liturgy. To do so, Harper’s team reconstructs with extreme care texts and rubrics from a selection of liturgical celebrations (masses, vespers, water rituals, reception of penitents). Using these reconstructions as their basis, they want to go a step further than the texts and get an impression of the experience as the result of the complex interplay of music, space, and ritual actions. Harper thus organizes ritual reenactments in historical locations as original as possible, where the reenactments are filmed by a professional crew and in turn form the basis for analyses along with reporting on the experiences of the participants. Extensive reports, as far as it is known, are not yet available, although there are some audiovisual recordings of parts of the project available.⁵⁷

This challenging project is stimulating in various ways. It meets the broad question of discovering and testing how people experienced ritual in earlier times. But it also invokes objections in the sense that, in the end, our only source are fragmentary texts (architecture viewed as text as well). All the rest, particularly reliving and experiencing the ritual, is reconstruction and thus construction. Experience with reenactments shows that there are many white areas and uncertainties; we discover how much we do not know. One can think here, for example, of timing and tempo (of walking, singing, silence), of order and hierarchy. Were actions carried out in succession or simultaneously? Who (men, women, children?) participated besides the explicitly mentioned members of the clergy?

A second perspective concerns the question of whether anything can indeed be said about ritual in the past. Also dealing with the Middle Ages is an essay by Philippe Buc with the challenging title *The Dangers of Ritual*.⁵⁸ In his study Buc goes further than pointing to fragmentary source material and the limits of experimental approaches like reenactments and raises more fundamental theoretical and methodological issues. He is extremely skeptical of using modern (social science) concepts and approaches in historical research. He aims for a “native’s implicit anthropology” of medieval ritual in contrast to the “explicit [one], of the twentieth-century social scientist.”⁵⁹ Here “ritual” emerges as a key concept in Buc’s view—in a twofold way. On the one hand, ritual was embedded in the past in a very complex and often extremely ambiguous context. Buc shows how difficult it is to describe the context, and to discover it. And if we do trace the contours, ritual proves to be “dangerous” in the sense of being a medium for deceit and manipulation. That is why Buc argues for restraint in using ritual as a way to access the studies of culture of the past. On the other hand, there is also the “self-evident” academic baggage that accompanies the concept “ritual.” Here he is thinking of anthropology in particular, and here as well Buc sees a danger, the danger of the easy and uncritical attitude by which historians embrace the social sciences. For these reasons, Buc devotes a great deal of his essay to the history of the concept of ritual since the Reformation (not entirely a new undertaking, for that matter; cf. the work of Talal Asad⁶⁰).

Harper and Buc provide two extremes of the possibilities and impossibilities of the study of ritual in the past. There are also good examples that show that one can go beyond texts in exploring historical rituals. The popularity of ritual repertoires in classical studies has already been pointed out. And there are also decidedly valuable partial studies on ritual repertoires in the past whereby, among other things, egodocuments are often used.⁶¹

Ritual and Cultural Memory Studies

One area that is developing strongly and has direct links with ritual studies is the area of cultural memory studies. This also concerns a multi-interdisciplinary platform for studies into the sociocultural dimensions of remembering and commemoration. Two important impulses for these studies have been merging since the 1980s. This concerns,

first, influential theoretical perspectives in the area of remembering in a culture and dealing with the past, as found in Maurice Halbwachs and Jan Assmann, who placed the central concept of “cultural memory” on the map. Second, there has been a true “memory boom” since the 1980s on a global scale. The commemoration culture around World Wars I and II and the Holocaust are central here,⁶² but the palette is decidedly broader and includes a number of ritual practices of “performing the past.”⁶³

In the meantime a full-fledged academic field has emerged. A good introduction can be found in the handbook edited by Astrid Erll, Anscar Nünning, and Sarah Young.⁶⁴

Cultural memory studies pays a great deal of attention to commemoration places and monuments, particularly those in the public domain. Kenneth Foote’s study of the “politics of spatial forgetting and remembering” of tragedies has not yet received much attention.⁶⁵ Related to this is a volume on “grassroots memorials” edited by Peter Jan Margry and Cristina Sánchez-Carretero.⁶⁶ This study looks at memorials and rituals that arise after a tragedy or accident, such as roadside memorials after a car accident. These are examples of the process Grimes characterizes as “ritualizing” rituals in the making that is still in its infancy. Margry and Sánchez-Carretero define “grassroots memorials” as

The phenomenon of placing memorabilia, as a form of social action, in public spaces, usually at sites where traumatic deaths or events have taken place . . . Grassroots memorialization is understood as the process by which groups of people, imagined communities, or specific individuals bring grievances into action by creating an improvised and temporary memorial with the aim of changing or ameliorating a particular situation.⁶⁷

In the meantime there is also attention for the other extreme of memorial places, namely, “postponed monuments,” memorial places that come into existence many years after the event. In essence, the whole area of Holocaust memorial studies is an example of this.⁶⁸ Recently there is also attention for absent and hidden memorial culture (cf. absent ritual in the ongoing tragedy of shipwrecks with boat refugees in the Mediterranean Sea).

Finally, cultural memory studies touch directly on a topic in the traditional canon of ritual studies, that of rituals around death. Ritual studies has focused on death rituals for decades already. There appears to be a great amount of creativity in that field that is expressed in all kinds of newly developed rituals, and a layered and often particularly complex dynamics is manifested. It thus concerns the position of the deceased, the role of community, images of the hereafter, and, connected with that, the interplay of continuity and discontinuity, the individual and the collective, immanence and transcendence.

The attention will now turn to an important new line of research in studies into both death and cultural memory in general, namely, the role of new media, and the study of memorial culture in cyberspace. There has been a flourishing area of research falls under both ritual studies and cultural memory studies.⁶⁹ This brings us to a final challenging and new field, that of cyberritual.

Cyberritual

A final important interdisciplinary cluster that has not yet received sufficient attention in ritual studies, given its position in both contemporary culture and society as well as in academia, is the network society in which digital media plays a fundamental role. Cyberritual has taken its inevitable place in ritual studies, although it remains under construction. There is a growing understanding that modern ritual studies cannot avoid the cyber dimension. Digital perspectives and methods are going to play an increasingly prominent role within ritual studies. Developing an eye for cyberritual and the context of our network society, questions are being posed regarding the theoretical and methodological insights obtained.

Culture and Ritual in Cyberspace

With cyberritual we touch on a new emerging dimension of our culture.⁷⁰ Cyberreligion and cyberritual are part of this culture. This new mediation should not only be seen as a variant on traditional paths but also as a new context in its own right, with its own rules and frameworks. The digital frameworks raise challenging and fundamental questions in relation to traditional concepts and theoretical frameworks. These “e- or cyberperspectives” are associated with new academic platforms under the headings of e-science, e-humanities, digital culture studies and

e-culture studies. The network culture has not remained unnoticed in the social sciences and multidisciplinary forums like media and communication studies. The range is wide here, covering both the development and the use of digital technologies in research, and the reflection on concepts and foundations, artistic expression, virtual commemoration, gaming as cultural and also as ritual practice, virtual memorial culture, and the like. The importance of this for ritual studies is obvious. But whereas digital text analysis and data mining are becoming common property in many branches of the humanities, the application in religious and ritual studies is still in its infancy. The current author is surprised therefore at the lack of attention for cyberritual as a specific part of the cyberculture. There is, after all, a lot more happening here than simply a *transfer* of traditional ritual repertoires to a virtual environment like the Internet.

Apart from the importance of the development itself and the ensuing need to investigate it, there is the additional and not unimportant problem of research on these cyberfields finding itself confronted with entirely unique demands being made on research methods and techniques. As a result, methods and techniques of Internet field work are currently being explored in detail.⁷¹

Cyberritual and Ritual Studies

Surveying the area of ritual studies, the author does not see any spectacular rise in interest in cyberritual. This is remarkable because media in a general sense are and have been a favorite theme in ritual studies, as the influential work of Grimes proves in exemplary fashion.⁷² This picture is confirmed if we look at the two parts of *Theorizing Ritual* already cited earlier and the output of the large Heidelberg project on Ritual Dynamics.⁷³ However, upon closer inspection, the seeming lack of interest in cyberritual turns out to be mainly a question of perspective. If we look at the matter more closely and include the extensive field of communication and media studies with all kinds of niches, platforms, and networks, there appears to be a great deal of relevant research. There are many studies, focusing on, for example, contemporary forms of digital and virtual remembering, commemorating and mourning.⁷⁴

Cyberritual and Cyberreligion

The field of studying religion and ritual and the new digital media has been developing since the mid-1990s. The *Network for New Media, Religion and Digital Culture Studies* offers a good online bibliography of more than 517 titles.⁷⁵ Based in Heidelberg, there is a separate online journal devoted to religions on the Internet, which published an important theme issue in 2008 devoted entirely to ritual practices.⁷⁶ There are certain names and studies that stand out, that catch one's eye and seem to belong to a kind of unofficial canon. The names include Stephen O'Leary, Stephen Jacobs, Heidi Campbell, and Brenda Brasher.⁷⁷ A good entrance in the field is the work of Cheryl Casey.⁷⁸

The field of religion and Internet studies includes four categories: effects, content, use, and methodological approaches, in which there seems to be a clear emphasis on the first category.

These studies are characterized by a prevalent attitude of ambivalence. Online religious ritual lacks any kind of physical presence, but the combination of text, picture, video, and sound makes a very new palette of ritual interaction available. In all case studies, among which Brenda Braher's 2001 study, *Give Me that Online Religion*, was trendsetting,⁷⁹ we find this ambivalent attitude returning. Classic themes are the participant/spectator relation and the physical presence as a characteristic of "true" ritual. An important voice here was O'Leary's, who in 1996, in what has become a classic article, indicated that as a result of the rise of cyberspace we would need to adjust our ideas of religion and ritual as well as our way of approaching them.⁸⁰ Often, the critical attitude involves ecclesiastical norms and those in the area of the theology of sacraments. Physicality is said to be an inseparable part of ritual practices and sacramental mediations. We also find frequent references to the dangers of "cyberrelativism." And the old dichotomy between modern technology and religion is never far away and always there in the background. The relationship between real space and virtual space is problematized. Many emphasize that much of cyberspace ritual is a "recreation" of offline ritual, and that therefore something essential is "missing": certain dimensions are lacking, and this adversely affects the "ritual content."

Notable of many studies on Internet religion and Internet ritual is the often very traditional content given to religion and ritual. Religion tends to be primarily equated with institutional religion, with—an almost classical exception—forms of neopaganism (which stands out as a new spiritual movement by making full use of virtual ritual forms⁸¹).

The same obtains for ritual. The “usual suspects” appear when the theoretical positioning of ritual is discussed: Geertz, Tambiah, Turner, Rappaport.⁸² This has led to a traditional religious and “high liturgical” image of ritual with dominant characteristics: religious, conventional, rigid, repetitive, traditional, and “highly conservative.” But there are also authors who introduce important nuances, such as Nadja Miczek in an article from 2008.⁸³ She makes a sharp distinction between “ritual online” and “online-ritual,” and also includes in her explorations “virtual worlds” and “worlds” for online gaming—SecondLife, Alpha World, and others—where avatars and role playing are determinative. “Ritual online” concerns rituals that are performed or done in an offline context, while “online-ritual” are rituals that are carried out online in a virtual setting like the well-known Church of Fools and the churches in SecondLife. Miczek takes an open “polythetic” approach to ritual where, rather than working with a fixed definition, she concentrates on characteristics or qualities of ritual. She chooses the concept of “ritual transfer” as a theoretical and heuristic instrument, whereby she assumes the relation to and continuity of cyberspace with the “real” offline world as a preamble. “Transfer” here has three dimensions: (re)presentation, structure, and content. Her case study shows how changes in ritual are found primarily at the level of (re)presentation and structure and hardly ever concern the content. This involves a strong orientation toward language and text, more flexible communication, and a changed position of ritual embodiment.

Perspectives for Ritual Studies

Cyberculture and the subfield of cyberritual offer an important and very topical domain of ritual studies because the medium of the Internet offers a platform for a tremendous variety of sometimes seemingly contrasting developments, such as the influence of the processes of globalization and (super)diversification versus that of localization and the unity of religion and ritual in virtual reality. It poses penetrating questions and allows for fundamental critical reflection on rituality. The relation and tension between “virtual” reality and the “empirical” reality that is “lived” every day can be studied in relationship: ultimately, the “virtual” rituality becomes “lived” reality through manifestations and actions of people in daily life. The study of the “translation” of the (super)diversity of the “virtual” rituality to the “lived” rituality is one of the most challenging fields of research at the moment.

In this author’s opinion, the topic of virtuality and authenticity is an important perspective of this theme. Reflection on cyberspace constantly confronts us with the ambivalence regarding “virtuality,” which evokes the opposition between “real” and “not real,” between authentic and inauthentic. The crux here is the relationship between online and offline culture, between virtual and real space. “Virtual” is easily, rather too easily, connected with “unreal” and “inauthentic” through a number of closely associated comparative perspectives. It is extraordinarily difficult to describe or define virtuality and to estimate the distinctive value of the parameters used for labeling.

In summary, we could state that the area of cyberritual in ritual studies is being entered and explored hesitantly. It is one of the most challenging and innovative thematic research clusters of the future. Four research perspectives can already be indicated.

- (a) First of all, the basic distinction between ritual online on the one hand, that is, offline ritual transferred to the online world, and online ritual on the other. Many repertoires that are called cyberrituals are, upon closer examination, real-life rituals reproduced online.
- (b) The insight that obtains, as it does for online culture in general, is that what is at issue in ritual as well is a continuous and complex interplay between online and offline.
- (c) Third, some topics in particular emerge in the critical reflection on ritual in the cybercontext. In addition to the already mentioned Virtuality/Reality topic, there are: Identity, Community, Authority, Authenticity, and again: The Sacred and Religion.
- (d) Fourth, there is the perspective that traditional concepts and theoretical frameworks are inadequate in cyberritual, that one has to look there and study in completely new and open ways. And that will then give new impulses again to ritual studies.

Cyberpilgrimage?

Just as the third part of this contribution on ritual studies started with pilgrimage, it will now conclude with it to make this final perspective clear. There has been a debate for some time in a relatively smaller circle on the unique nature of cyberpilgrimage, in the sense of online pilgrimage.⁸⁴

There are two positions here, a deductive one and an inductive one. Starting from the Turnerian definition of pilgrimage, Nick Couldry asks: Will the concept of pilgrimage survive online? Or: Is pilgrimage online possible?⁸⁵ His overall conclusion is: "Regardless of the emotions associated with an online experience, it will not count as a pilgrimage until it is, first, recognizable as a journey across space that I can do, and in doing so follow the path of others who have done it before me."⁸⁶ In contrast, Heidi Campbell offers room for new constituent elements in cyberpilgrimage.⁸⁷ She emphasizes the interactive aspect and participation surrounding the place. She views cyberpilgrimage as a forum, a new ritual forum. With offline pilgrimage the goal is set; online pilgrimages involve an ongoing process, people openly go online and explore cyberspace, often without any predetermined goal in mind. People search and find, explore, allow themselves to be surprised, they are surfing for the sacred. In this way Campbell breaks with the traditional benchmarks of pilgrimage; that applies to both the sacred place that becomes a forum for connections and to the journey that becomes a searching peregrination.

Historiography

To accurately review the historiography of ritual studies, it might be helpful to list three major phases of Western academic study: (1) the definition of academic disciplines in the late 19th and early 20th century; (2) a fruitful period of interdisciplinary research during the 1960s and 1970s; and finally, (3) the state of research today, in which various disciplines are connected and integrated into large, thematic clusters. This section focuses on research related to ritual, but there is also a close (though not one on one) relation with ritual dynamics in society and culture (cf. the memory boom we have noted since the 1980s or the impact of the ritual renewal movement in the Roman Catholic Church).

The first phase ran from the 19th century—with a long prehistory in theology and philosophy and via the Enlightenment and Industrial Revolution—up to and including the first half of the 20th century, right up to the long decade of the 1960s. The study of ritual is prominently present in a series of academic traditions that would later become manifest as disciplines or subdisciplines. An illustration can be philosophy in which ritual is an important topic via symbol and language. Influential here is philosophy of language with the "speech-act" approach of John Austin (1911–1960). One can think here also of Susanne Langer (1895–1985) and Paul Ricoeur (1913–2005). Theology is also important here, with liturgical studies as a new discipline formed in connection with the Liturgical Movement. Very influential and, to a certain extent, the basis for later ritual studies was the phenomenology of religion or (comparative) religious studies. There is some overlapping here with theology and also with the—still to be mentioned—tradition of ethnography, ethnology, and cultural anthropology. The tradition of the phenomenology of religion can be seen in various ways in the study of ritual. A *legacy* is undeniably present, an inheritance and taxability, although in the form of response. Jonathan Smith and his relationship to Mircea Eliade, whom he succeeded in Chicago, is illustrative here.⁸⁸ Names in this legacy of phenomenology of religion are: William Robertson Smith (1846–1894, originally an Old Testament scholar), Rudolf Otto (1869–1937), Friedrich Heiler (1892–1967), Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890–1950), Mircea Eliade (1907–1986). Given a strong context of mission and colonialism, there was also the rise of ethnography and in Europe itself cultural anthropology or European ethnology. In the 20th century this tradition would, fed by other impulses as well, become established as the social sciences via anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Here as well the following names can be cited: Arnold van Gennep (1873–1957), Alfred Radcliffe-Brown (1881–1955), James George Frazer (1854–1941), Edmund Leach (1910–1989), Victor Turner (1920–1983), Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908–2009), Clifford Geertz (1926–2006), Erving Goffman (1922–1982), Émile Durkheim (1858–1917), Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), and Carl G. Jung (1875–1961).

These are only the main lines of the first phase. There are many other aspects we could discuss here, such as the rise of semiotics in connection with Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914) and Algirdas Greimas (1917–1992), and cultural history (Johan Huizinga (1872–1945) with Huizinga's very influential *Homo Ludens* from 1938).

The second phase started around the 1960s. Although there was strong, widespread rejection of ritual, especially religious, ecclesiastical, and institutional ritual, at the same time a new interest in ritual and the study of ritual also found good soil. Through the tradition of the liturgical renewal movement and Vatican II, the anthropological layers of liturgy came into view and all kinds of academic border traffic started occurring. Philosophy also came on stage via the tradition of phenomenology, but the strongly emerging social sciences were the most prominent. Although it also gave occasion for all kinds of tensions and border skirmishes, the immediate basis for the rise of what we now call ritual studies can be found here. An important stimulus was that there was not only an "anthropological turn"

but also a “cultural,” “popular,” or “subaltern turn.” That is reflected in, for example, new forms of cultural history. Influenced by French *Annales* School the approach via institutions and events were no longer deemed satisfactory. Rather, cultural patterns were sought: culture with a lower-case “c,” emotions and human behavior, culture as it was lived. This swing, which came down to a strong interest in “popular culture,” often settled on ritual repertoires as the points of access. It was discovered how one could penetrate deeply into a culture via rituals. The rise of gender studies can be situated in the context. This change in cultural studies also gives occasion for all kinds of contact with the social sciences, especially anthropology. So, we see great interest in ritual in the 1960s and 1970s growing in the cited academic fields of cultural studies, religious studies, social sciences, especially anthropology, and partly philosophy, with more multidisciplinary than previously. Falling into that area, as we saw in 1977 for the first time, was the term “ritual studies” as a field of research, and the field took root with symposiums and conferences, collections of scholarly papers, books, and its own journal as of 1987 (*Journal of Ritual Studies*). More broadly, ritual studies can involve musicology, archaeology, art history, psychology, architecture, semiotics, cultural geography.

Ritual studies rose as a platform or field, perhaps as an expression of a “ritual turn” similar to other cited “turns” (which were often indicated only later via the description of a development). That depends primarily on how people describe a “turn.” If we assume a description that includes not only a new focus as its object or topic but also the means and medium of knowledge and research, we can indeed speak of a “ritual turn.”⁸⁹

In the meantime, ritual studies has arrived at a new phase. The turn of the millennium can perhaps be viewed as a temporal marker for this phase in a broad sense. The change in ritual studies is characterized by two cohering tendencies. The rise and fruits of major multidisciplinary collaboration projects go hand in hand with the rise of more or less major thematic clusters in which ritual studies can be thematized. Some of the clusters we already know from the second and first phases belong to the so-called canon of ritual studies, such as sacred places and pilgrimage. This tendency of multidisciplinary major thematic clusters, research that is thus far less explicitly linked to traditionally defined disciplines, is an important perspective for ritual studies. After all, this tendency does link up directly with the rise of and nature of the platform of ritual studies. Important current clusters include the formation of theory regarding ritual (“Theorizing Ritual”), place and space, leisure culture, especially tourism, as well as thematization, pilgrimage, material religion, memory/memorial studies, and (closely connected with this) studies on dying, death, and commemoration. Finally, a new field that is arising within and across the clusters cited is the field of e- or cyberritual.

Further Reading

Selected Titles

Asad, Talal. “Towards a Genealogy of the Concept of Ritual.” In *Genealogies of Religion*. By Talal Asad, 55–82. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bell, Catherine. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Bradshaw, Paul, and John Melloh, eds. *Foundations in Ritual Studies: A Reader for Students of Christian Worship*. Ada, MI: Baker, 2007. Includes articles by Turner, Bell, Geertz, Grimes, Douglas, Rappaport, Kelleher, Asad, Mitchell, Lévi-Strauss, and Guardini.

Brosius, Christiane, Axel Michaelis, and Paula Schrode, eds. *Ritual und Ritualdynamik. Schlüsselbegriffe, Theorien, Diskussionen*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Douglas, Mary. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. New York: Pantheon, 2003.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Praeger, 2002. Originally published in 1966.

Gennep, Arnold van. *The Rites of Passage*. 7th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975. Originally

published in 1960.

Grimes, Ronald. *Beginnings in Ritual Studies*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982. Rev. ed. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995; 3d ed. Waterloo, ON: Ritual Studies International, 2013).

Grimes, Ronald. *Research in Ritual Studies. A Programmatic Essay and Bibliography*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1985.

Grimes, Ronald, ed. *Readings in Ritual Studies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996. Modified German-language version edited by Andréa Belliger and David J. Krieger, . Opladen, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1998.

Grimes, Ronald. *Deeply into the Bone. Reinventing Rites of Passage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Grimes, Ronald. *The Craft of Ritual Studies*. Oxford Ritual Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Harvey, Graham, ed. *Ritual and Religious Belief. A Reader*. London: Equinox, 2005. Includes texts of: Luther, Smith, Bloch, Tambiah, Flanagan, Reader, King, Schieffelin, Ter Haar, Kertzer, Sered, Severi, Ruel, Bell.

Huizinga, Johan. *Homo Ludens. A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*. London: Routledge, 1944. Originally published in Dutch in 1938.

Kreinath, Jens, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg, eds. *Theorizing Rituals*. Vol. 1, *Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2006.

Kreinath, Jens, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg, eds. *Theorizing Rituals*. Vol. 2, *Annotated Bibliography of Ritual Theory, 1966–2005*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2007.

Michaelis, Axel, ed. *Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual*. Vol. 1, *Grammars and Morphologies of Ritual Practices in Asia*; Vol. 2, *Body, Performance, Agency and Experience*; Vol. 3, *State, Power and Violence*; Vol. 4, *Reflexivity, Media and Visuality*; Vol. 5, *Transfer and Spaces*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrossowitz, 2010. Proceedings of the international conference “Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual” (2008).

Post, Paul, Ronald L. Grimes, Albertina Nugteren, Per Pettersson, and Hessel Zondag. *Disaster Ritual: Explorations of an Emerging Ritual Repertoire*. Liturgia condenda 15. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2003.

Post, Paul, Philip Nel, and Walter van Beek, eds. *Sacred Sites, Contested Grounds. Space and Ritual Dynamics in Europe and Africa*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2014.

Rappaport, Roy. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Rappaport, Roy. “The Obvious Aspects of Ritual.” In *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*. By Roy Rappaport, 173–221. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic, 1979.

Schechner, Richard. *The Future of Ritual: Writings on Culture and Performance*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Stewart, Pamela, and Andrew Strathern, eds. *Ritual. The International Library of Essays in Anthropology*. Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate, 2010.

Stewart, Pamela, and Andrew Strathern. *Ritual: Key Concepts in Religion*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Staal, Frits. “The Meaninglessness of Ritual.” *Numen* 26 (1979): 2–22.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Harmondsworth, U.K.: Penguin, 1995. Originally published in 1969.

Whitehouse, Harvey, and James Laidlaw, eds. *Ritual and Memory: Towards a Comparative Anthropology of*

Religion. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2004.

Journals and Series

Carolina Academic Press Ritual Studies Monographs Series. Durham, NC, 2001–.

Journal of Ritual Studies. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh, 1987–.

Liturgia Condenda. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 1993–.

Netherlands Studies in Ritual and Liturgy. Tilburg and Groningen, The Netherlands: Institute for Ritual and Liturgical Studies, 2003–.

Oxford Ritual Studies Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010–.

Symbol, Myth, and Ritual. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1973–.

Yearbook for Liturgical and Ritual Studies. Tilburg and Groningen, The Netherlands: Institute for Ritual and Liturgical Studies, 1985–.

Acknowledgements

This article is based partly on earlier overviews of ritual studies: Paul Post, "Ritual Studies. Einführung und Ortsbestimmung," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 45 (2003): 21–45; Paul Post, "Über die Liturgische Bewegung hinaus . . . Ein Literaturbericht zu neueren Liturgie- und ritualwissenschaftlichen Studien aus niederländischer Perspektive (2005–2007)," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 51 (2009)[2010]: 66–95; Paul Post, "Panorama der Ritual Studies. Trends und Themen der aktuellen Ritual Studies," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* (2015); Paul Post, "Fields of the sacred," In *Sacred Places in Modern Western Culture*, edited by Paul Post, Arie Molendijk, and Justin Kroesen, 13–59 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011); and Paul Post and Suzanne van der Beek, *Doing Ritual Criticism in a Network Society, Offline and Online Explorations Pilgrimage and Sacred Place* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2015).

Notes:

- (1.) Ronald Grimes, *Beginnings in Ritual Studies* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982; 3d ed., 2013); Ronald Grimes, *Research in Ritual Studies. A Programmatic Essay and Bibliography* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1985).
- (2.) See conference acts in *Studia Liturgica* 23, no. 1 (1993).
- (3.) Cf. the theme issue *The Institutionalization of Cultural Studies*, *Cultural Studies* 12, no. 4 (1998).
- (4.) Grimes, *Research in Ritual Studies*, 1.
- (5.) Grimes, *Research in Ritual Studies*, Preface.
- (6.) Grimes, *Research in Ritual Studies*, Preface.
- (7.) Ronald Grimes, "Ritual Studies," in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed., Mircea Eliade (New York: Macmillan, 1987), 12:422.
- (8.) Ronald Grimes, "Ritual, Performance, and the Sequestering of Sacred Space," in *Discourse in Ritual Studies*, ed., Hans Schilderman (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 153.
- (9.) Ronald Grimes, *The Craft of Ritual Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 7. On ritual studies, see introduction, 1–8, esp. 6–7.
- (10.) *Ritualdynamik, Sonderforschungsbereich (SDB) 619*, international conference: *Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual*, Heidelberg September 29–October 2, 2008. *Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual*, series

- ed., Axel Michaels: Vol. 1, *Grammars and Morphologies of Ritual Practices in Asia*; Vol. 2, *Body, Performance, Agency and Experience*; Vol. 3, *State, Power and Violence*; Vol. 4, *Reflexivity, Media and Visuality*; Vol. 5, *Transfer and Spaces* (Wiesbaden: Harrossowitz, 2010), proceedings of the international conference "Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual" (2008).
- (11.) Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg, eds., *Theorizing Rituals: Vol. 1, Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2006); Vol. 2, *Annotated Bibliography of Ritual Theory, 1966–2005* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2007).
- (12.) Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual. Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).
- (13.) Grimes, *Craft of Ritual Studies*, chap. 7 and Appendix 1.
- (14.) Paul Post, "Introduction," in *Disaster Ritual. Explorations of an Emerging Ritual Repertoire*, eds., Paul Post, Ronald L. Grimes, A. Nugteren, Per Pettersson, and Hessel Zondag (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2003) (Liturgia condenda 15), 37–40.
- (15.) Roy Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 24.
- (16.) Ronald Grimes, *Deeply into the Bone: Re-inventing Rites of Passage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 71.
- (17.) Paul Post, "Fields of the Sacred," in *Sacred Places in Modern Western culture*, eds., Paul Post, Arie Molendijk, and Justin Kroesen (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011), 18.
- (18.) Grimes, *Craft of Ritual Studies*, chap. 9, "Elements of Ritual."
- (19.) Post et al., *Disaster Ritual*, 41f.
- (20.) Catherine Bell, *Ritual. Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 94ff.
- (21.) Paul Post, "Fields of the Sacred," in *Sacred Places in Modern Western culture*, eds., Paul Post, Arie Molendijk, and Justin Kroesen (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011), 13–59.
- (22.) Grimes, *The Craft of Ritual Studies*, chap. 8: "Mapping Ritual."
- (23.) Some recent examples are *Approaching Rituals in Ancient Cultures*, eds., Claus Ambos and Lorenzo Verderame (Rome: Università La Sapienza, 2013), proceedings of a conference held in Rome in 2011) = *Rivista degli studi orientali*, suppl. Vol. 86, no. 2 (2011); *Grenzen in Ritual und Kult in der Antike, Internationales Kolloquium*, ed., Martin A. Guggisberg (Basel, Switzerland: Schwabe Verlag, 2009) = *Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 40 (2013); *Ritual Dynamics in the Ancient Mediterranean: Agency, Emotion, Gender, Representation*, ed., Angelos Chaniotis (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2011) = *Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien* 49, Heidelberg (2011); *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire*, eds., Olivier Hekster, Sebastian Schmidt-Hofner and Christian Witschel (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2009).
- (24.) *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquarum (ThesCRA)*: Vols. 1–8 (Los Angeles: Getty Museum, 2004–2012).
- (25.) Grimes, *Craft of Ritual Studies*, 203–207, Table 7.1.
- (26.) Cf. Catherine Bell, "Ritual Tensions: Tribal and Catholic," in *Studia Liturgica* 32, no. 1 (2001), 15–28.
- (27.) Paul Post, Philip Nel, and Walter van Beek, eds., *Sacred Sites, Contested Grounds. Space and Ritual Dynamics in Europe and Africa* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2014).
- (28.) Grimes, *Craft of Ritual Studies*, 223–230; Victor Turner's *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982) is a classic.
- (29.) Robert A. Segal, *The Myth and Ritual Theory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).
- (30.) Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor, 1959); Erving

Goffman, *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971); Richard Schechner, *Performance Studies: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2002).

(31.) Kim Knott, *The Location of Religion* (London: Equinox, 2005); Jonathan Smith, *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004); Martin Stringer, *Contemporary Western Ethnography and the Definition of Religion* (London: Continuum, 2008).

(32.) Arie L. Molendijk, "The Notion of the 'Sacred'," in *Holy Ground: Reinventing Ritual Space in Modern Western Culture*, eds., Paul Post and Arie L. Molendijk (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010) (Liturgia condenda 24), 55–89.

(33.) According to Smith, the distinction between sacred and profane is primarily a question of situation (place) and language; it is a social marker "to set things apart," Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place. Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 104s. Cf. Molendijk, "Notion of the Sacred," 84–89; cf. Ronald Grimes, "Jonathan Z. Smith's Theory of Ritual Space," in *Religion* 29 (1999), 261–273.

(34.) Mathew Evans, "The Sacred: Differentiating, Clarifying and Extending Concepts," in *Review of Religious Research* 45, no. 1 (2003), 32–47.

(35.) An overview of thinking and discussing the contemporary concept "religion" can be found in the more than one thousand pages of *Religion: Beyond a Concept*, ed., Hent de Vries (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008); see also Knott, *Location of Religion*.

(36.) Stringer, *Contemporary Western Ethnography*.

(37.) Stringer, *Contemporary Western Ethnography*, 16.

(38.) Stringer, *Contemporary Western Ethnography*, 113f.

(39.) Bell, *Ritual Theory*, chap. 5, 94–117.

(40.) Ronald Grimes, *Ritual Criticism: Case Studies in Its Practice, Essays on Its Theory* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1990); cf. Tolle Swinkels and Paul Post, "Beginnings in Ritual Studies according to Ronald Grimes," *Jaarboek voor Liturgie-onderzoek* 19 (2003), 215–238, here 3.3., 226–234. Cf. *Theorizing Rituals*, eds., J. Kreinath, J. Snoek and M. Stausberg: Vol. 2, *Annotated Bibliography of Ritual Theory, 1966–2005* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 161–163.

(41.) Grimes, *Craft of Ritual Studies*, 71–75. The five "vectors" of ritual criticism he presented earlier in a German collection of articles: Ronald Grimes and Ute Hüsken: "Ritualkritik," in *Ritual und Ritualdynamik. Schlüsselbegriffe, Theorien, Diskussionen*, eds., Christiane Brosius, Axel Michaelis, and Paula Schrode (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 159–164.

(42.) Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 40.

(43.) Ritual Studies International: Videos, Ronald L. Grimes.

(44.) Ronald Grimes, "Liturgical Supinity, Liturgical Erectitude: On the Embodiment of Ritual Authority," *Studia Liturgica* 23(1993), 51–61; also in Ronald Grimes, *Reading, Writing, and Ritualizing: Ritual in Fictive, Liturgical and Public Places* (Washington, DC: Pastoral, 1993), 39–58.

(45.) See notes 40 and 41.

(46.) Paul Post, "Ritual criticism. Een actuele verkenning van kritische reflectie ten aanzien van ritueel, met bijzondere aandacht voor e-ritueel en cyberpilgrimage," *Jaarboek voor Liturgieonderzoek/Yearbook for Liturgical and Ritual Studies* 29 (2013), 173–199.

(47.) Eric Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds., Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1–14; cf. Paul Post, "Rituals and the Function of the Past: Rereading Eric Hobsbawm," *Journal of Ritual Studies* 10, no. 2 (1996), 91–108.

(48.) *Sacred Places in Modern Western Culture*, eds., Paul Post, Arie L. Molendijk, and Justin Kroesen (Leuven,

Belgium, and Paris: Peeters, 2011), 329–348; *Holy Ground: Re-inventing Ritual Space in Modern Western Culture*, eds., Paul Post and Arie L. Molendijk (= *Liturgia condenda* 24) (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010); *Voorbij het kerkgebouw. De speelruimte van een ander sacraal domein*, ed., Paul Post (Heeswijk, The Netherlands: Uitgeverij Abdij van Berne, 2010); *Shrines and Pilgrimage in the Modern World*, ed., Peter Jan Margry (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008) with places that are cherished for politics, sports, music, spirituality, and death.

(49.) Michael Stausberg, *Religion im modernen Tourismus* (Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen, 2010), esp. chap. 3, 40–59; Michael Stausberg, *Religion and Tourism: Crossroads, Destinations and Encounters* (London and New York: Routledge, 2010); Ellen Badone and Sharon R. Roseman, eds., *Intersecting Journeys: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004); Paul Post, “De pelgrim en de toerist: Verkenning van een topos,” *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 67, no. 2 (2013), 135–149.

(50.) Simon Coleman and John Elsner, eds., *Pilgrim Voices: Narratives and Authorship in Christian Pilgrimage* (New York: Berghahn, 2003); Alexandra Peat, *Travel and Modernist Literature: Sacred and Ethical Journeys*, Routledge Studies in Twentieth-Century Literature 15 (New York: Routledge, 2011).

(51.) Paul Post, Philip Nel, and Walter van Beek, eds., *Sacred Sites, Contested Grounds: Space and Ritual Dynamics in Europe and Africa* (Trenton, NJ: African World Press, 2014); *Pilgrims and Politics: Rediscovering the Power of the Pilgrimage*, ed., Anton Pazos (Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate, 2012).

(52.) John Eade, “From Race to Religion: Multiculturalism and Contested Urban Space,” in *Post-Secular Cities: Space, Theory and Practice*, eds., Justin Beaumont and Christopher Baker (London and New York: Continuum, 2011), chap. 9, 154–167.

(53.) Dionigi Albera and Maria Couroucli, eds., *Religions traversés: lieux saints partagés entre chrétiens, musulmans et juifs en Méditerranée* (Paris and Arles, France: Actes Sud, 2009); Robert Hayden, “Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites in South Asia and the Balkans,” *Current Anthropology* 432 (2002), 205–231; Robert Logan Sparks, *Ambiguous Spaces: A Contextualization of Shared Pilgrimage in Ephesus* (Phd diss., Tilburg University, School of Humanities, 2011).

(54.) Harvey Whitehouse, *Inside the Cult: Religious Innovation and Transmission in Papua New Guinea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Harvey Whitehouse, *Arguments and Icons: Divergent Modes of Religiosity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Harvey Whitehouse, *Modes of Religiosity: A Cognitive Theory of Religious Transmission* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2004); Harvey Whitehouse and James Laidlaw, eds., *Religion, Anthropology and Cognitive Science* (Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 2007); a number of writers test Whitehouse’s theory of van Divergent Modes of Religiosity (DMR) critically in the volume *Ritual and Memory: Towards a Comparative Anthropology of Religion*, eds., Harvey Whitehouse and James Laidlaw (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2004); cf. for critical discussions, see Kelly Bulkeley, “Review of Altamira Press’ ‘Cognitive Science of Religion Series,’” *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 16, no. 3 (2006), 239–242; Ilkka Pyysiäinen, “Memories: Religion and Cultural Transmission,” *Anthropological Quarterly* 72, no. 9 (2006), 341–353; Sebastian Schuler, *Numen* 53 (2006), 516–520.

(55.) Explaining Religion, University of Oxford.

(56.) Harvey Whitehouse: “Human Rites,” *Aeon Magazine* (December 12, 2012).

(57.) The Experience of Worship, School of Music, Bangor University (accessed January 2015); Harper allowed the author access to an unpublished paper: John Harper, “Investigating Medieval Ritual Through Liturgical Enactment” (9pp).

(58.) Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual. Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001); cf. Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 1 (2003), 148f.

(59.) Buc, *Dangers of Ritual*, 3.

(60.) Talal Asad, “Towards a Genealogy of the Concept of Ritual,” in Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 55–82.

- (61.) Edward Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*, 2d ed. (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2005) (New Approaches to European History); Gerd Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale. Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter*, 2d ed. (Darmstadt: Primus, 2013); Friedrich Lurz, *Erlebte Liturgie. Autobiografische Schriften als liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen* (Münster, Germany: LIT, 2003) (Ästhetik, Theologie, Liturgie 28); Stefan Böntert, *Friedlicher Kreuzzug und fromme Pilger. Liturgiehistorische Studien zur Heilig-Land-Wallfahrt im Spiegel deutschsprachiger Pilgerberichte des späten 19. Jahrh.* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2013) (Liturgia condenda 27); Minou Schraven, *Festive Funerals in Early Modern Italy* (Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate, 2014).
- (62.) For example, Marita Sturken, Jay Winter, and James Young.
- (63.) Karin Tilmans, Frank van Vree, and Jay Winter, eds., *Performing the Past. Memory, History, and Identity in Modern Europe* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010).
- (64.) Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, eds., *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2008); Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, eds., *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2010); Astrid Erll, *Memory in Culture* (Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney, eds., *Mediation, Remediation and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2009).
- (65.) Kenneth Foote, *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy* (Rev. ed., Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003); Kenneth Foote, *Shadowed Ground, Sacred Place: Reflections on Violence, Tragedy, Memorials and Public Commemorative Rituals*, in *Holy Ground*, eds., Paul Post, Arie Molendijk and Justin Kroesen, 93–111.
- (66.) Peter Jan Margry and Cristina Sánchez-Carretero, eds., *Grassroots Memorials. The Politics of Memorializing Traumatic Death* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2012).
- (67.) Margry and Sánchez-Carretero, *Grassroots Memorials*, 2–4.
- (68.) Laurie Faro, *Postponed Monuments in the Netherlands. Manifestation, Context and Meaning* (Tilburg and Groningen, The Netherlands: Institute of Ritual and Liturgical Studies, 2015).
- (69.) Paul Arthur, Pixelated Memory: "Online Commemoration of Trauma and Crisis" in *Interactive Media* 4 (2008). Paul Arthur, "Trauma Online: Public Exposure of Personal Grief and Suffering," *Traumatology* 15 (2009), 65–75; Kirsten Foot, Barbara Warnick, and Steven M. Schneider, "Web-based Memorializing after September 11: Toward a Conceptual Framework," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 1 (2005), 72–96; Cecile Post, "Memorial Culture in a Virtual World: The Digital Monument to the Jewish Community in the Netherlands," (Phd diss., University of Manchester, 2010); Pamela Roberts, "The Living and the Dead: Community in the Virtual Cemetery," *Omega: The Journal of Death and Dying* 49 (2004), 57–76; Pamela Roberts and Lourdes Vidal, "Perpetual Care in Cyberspace: A Portrait of Memorials on the Web," *Omega: The Journal of Death and Dying* 40 (1999), 521–545.
- (70.) The prefixes *cyber-* and *e-* (or *E-*, standing for electronic) are used here to refer in general terms to the context of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and digital new media; for the time being, they are also used as an equivalent for a variety of other terms, such as *i-*, *digital*, *online*, *Internet*, *virtual*, *net-*, *network*, etc.
- (71.) Christine Hine, *Virtual Ethnography* (London: SAGE, 2000); Robert Kozinets, *Netnography: Doing Ethnography Research Online* (London: SAGE, 2010); Daniel Miller and Don Slater, *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach* (Oxford: Berg, 2000).
- (72.) Ronald Grimes, "Ritual and the Media," in *Practicing Religion in the Age of the Media*, eds., Stuart Hoover and Lynn Clark (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 219–234; Ronald Grimes, *Deeply into the Bone: Re-inventing Rites of Passage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Ronald Grimes, Ute Hüsken, Udo Simon, and Eric Venbrux, eds., *Ritual, Media, and Conflict* (Oxford Ritual Studies series) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Grimes, *Craft of Ritual Studies*, esp. 78–92.
- (73.) Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg, eds., *Theorizing Rituals* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2006/2007): Vol. 1, *Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*; *Theorizing Rituals*; Vol. 2, *Annotated Bibliography of*

Ritual Theory, 1966–2005. For the Heidelberg project, see note 10.

(74.) Andrew Hoskins, "Digital Network Memory," in *Mediation, Remediation and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*, eds., Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 91–106.

(75.) Network for New Media, Religion and Digital Culture Studies: Bibliography. Heidi Campbell is by far the most productive writer in the area of *online religion/religion-online*. *Digital Religion. Understanding Religious Practice in New Media Worlds*, ed., Heidi Campbell (Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2013) (key themes in this collection are: Ritual, Identity, Community, Authority, Authenticity, Religion). There is also a tradition of (Christian) missionary, pastoral, and theological literature. Valuable (pastoral) theological studies are: Stephan Böntert, *Gottesdienste im Internet: Perspektiven eines Dialogs zwischen Internet und Liturgie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005).

(76.) *Online—[Heidelberg] Journal of Religions on the Internet*; Kerstin Radde-Antweiler, ed., *Being Virtual Real? Virtual Worlds from a Cultural Studies' Perspective* = *Online* volume 03.1 (2008): <http://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/religions/issue/view/153> (accessed July 2014).

(77.) We are referring to the online bibliography mentioned in note 73. Cf. now also: *Digital Religion. Understanding Religious Practice in New Media Worlds*, ed., Heidi Campbell (Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2013).

(78.) Cheryl A. Casey, *Virtual Ritual, Real Enactment: An Examination of the Conditions for Online Religious Ritual as Enacted Symbol* (Phd diss., New York University, 2007); Cheryl A. Casey, "Virtual Ritual, Real Faith: The Revirtualisation of Religious Ritual in Cyberspace," in *Online—Journal of Religions on the Internet* 2, no. 1 (2006), 73–90: <http://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/religions/article/view/377> (accessed April 2015) Cheryl A. Casey, *Symbol and Ritual Online: Case Studies in the Structure of Online Religious Rituals*. http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/6/0/2/1/p260217_index.html (accessed April 2015).

(79.) Brenda Brasher, *Give Me that Online Religion* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001).

(80.) Stephan O'Leary, "Cyberspace as Sacred Space: Communicating Religion on Computer Networks," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 64, no. 4 (1996), 781–808.

(81.) See, e.g., Stefan Aupers, "Technopaganism: Online Magic and the Mysterious Manifestation of Cyberspace," in *Sacred Places*, ed., Post, Molendijk & Kroesen, 321–326.

(82.) Stephen Jacobs, "Virtually Sacred: The Performance of Asynchronous Cyber-rituals in Online Spaces," *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication* 12, no. 3 (2007).

(83.) Nadja Miczek, "Online Rituals in Virtual Worlds: Christian Online Services between Dynamics and Stability," in *Online—Heidelberg Journal of Religions on the Internet* 03.1 (2008), 144–173.

(84.) Paul Post and Suzanne van der Beek, *Doing Ritual Criticism in a Network Society. Offline and Online Explorations into Pilgrimage and Sacred Place* (2015), chap. 4 "Cyberpilgrimage."

(85.) Nick Couldry, "Pilgrimage in Mediaspace: Continuities and Transformations," *Etnofoor* 20, no. 1 (2007), 63–74.

(86.) Couldry, "Pilgrimage in Mediaspace," 71.

(87.) Heidi Campbell, "A New Forum for Religion: Spiritual Pilgrimage Online," in *The Bible in Transmission* (Summer 2001), 1–2.

(88.) For this, see the theoretical and biographically rich book: Jonathan Z. Smith, *Relating Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

(89.) Doris Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Reinbek, Germany: Rowohlt, 2006), 26, cf. Benedikt Kranemann, "Theologie nach dem Ritual Turn. Perspektiven der Liturgiewissenschaft," in *Theologie in Cultural Turn. Erkenntnistheologische Erkundungen in einem veränderten Paradigma* = Salzburger interdisziplinäre Diskurse Bd. 4, ed., Judith Gruber (Bern, Switzerland: Lang, 2013), 151–173.

Paul Post

Tilburg University

